

Presently pending independent claim 18 includes the following features:

- (1) a ceramic layer;
- (2) a first resin layer on the first side of the ceramic layer so as to contact the ceramic layer;
- (3) a third resin layer on the first resin layer so as to contact the first resin layer; and
- (4) a strip line *between the first resin layer and the second resin layer*.

In the remarks submitted with the Amendment filed June 23, 2005, the Applicant asserted that the Yamada reference does not disclose or even suggest a strip line *between the first resin layer and the second resin layer*, as recited in claim 18 (identified as item 4 in the list of features provided above). Despite this assertion, the Examiner maintained the same prior art rejections in the outstanding Office Action, and it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's position is incorrect.

For illustrative purposes, an enlarged copy of Figure 4 from the Yamada reference has been prepared and attached hereto as an Appendix. In the Appendix, the various items shown in the drawing have been labeled according to the Examiner's interpretation as set forth in the outstanding Office Action. Specifically, layer 15 has been identified as the ceramic layer of claim 18, top layer 17 has been identified as the first resin layer of claim 18, bottom layer 17 has been identified as the second resin layer of claim 18, the sealing layer 6 has been identified as the third resin layer of claim 18, and circuit pattern 12 has been identified as an impedance element of claim 18.

In line 5 on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated that the Yamada reference teaches a strip line 2 formed between the first resin layer (top layer 17) and the third resin layer (sealing resin 6). In item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner responded to the Applicant's previous arguments by asserting that the strip line between the first resin layer and the third resin layer "can be found in Fig. 4 wherein the element 12 is formed between the resin 6 and the first resin 17." In view of the Examiner's identification of element 2 as corresponding to the strip line on page 3 of the Office Action, it *appears* that the number "12" appearing in item 4 of the Office Action is an error, and should read number "2." Regardless, as

indicated in the enlarged version of Fig. 4, neither the strip line 2 nor the impedance element 12 is located between the first resin layer (top layer 17) and the third resin layer (sealing resin 6). In this regard, element 2 is a multi-layered circuit conductor, and has been indicated in the Appendix by providing a star at each end for ease of identification. As clearly illustrated in Fig. 4, element 2 is located within the ceramic layer 15 between the top layer 17 and the bottom layer 17, but is not located between the first resin layer (top layer 17) and the third resin layer (sealing resin 6) as required in independent claim 18. In addition, impedance element 12 is located within ceramic layer 19, and is also not located between the first resin layer and the third resin layer.

As explained above, the Yamada reference does not disclose or even suggest the combination of four elements enumerated above, which are recited in independent claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Yamada reference does not anticipate or even render obvious the invention recited in independent claim 18. Moreover, because the Takaya reference also does not disclose or suggest the strip line arranged as recited in claim 18, it is submitted that claim 18 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 32 includes the following features:

- (1) a ceramic layer;
- (2) an impedance element including a patterned inductor on the ceramic layer;
- (3) a resin layer over the first side of the ceramic layer, and the resin layer having a first side facing the first side of the ceramic layer and having a second side opposite the first side of the resin layer;
- (4) a ground pattern on the second side of the resin layer (i.e., the side opposite the ceramic layer); and
- (5) the ground pattern and the pattern inductor are arranged *so that no portion of the ground pattern is located on a portion of the second side of the resin layer opposite a portion of the first side of the resin layer facing the pattern inductor.*

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner did not even attempt to identify in the prior art the relationship between the ground pattern and the patterned inductor as recited in independent claim 32 and identified in item (5) above. In particular, in lines 3-5 on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner appeared to identify the land grid array 7 of the Yamada reference as corresponding to the ground pattern recited in independent claim 32. Furthermore, in item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner responded to the Applicant's previous arguments by asserting that the ground layer 7 of the Yamada reference is formed on the second side of layer 17. However, as noted above, the Examiner did not explain how the Yamada reference teaches the relationship between the ground pattern and the patterned inductor recited in claim 32 and identified in item (5) set forth above.

Assuming that the circuit pattern 12 of the Yamada reference is an impedance element as suggested by the Examiner, and the land grid array 7 of the Yamada reference is a ground pattern as suggested by the Examiner, than Fig. 4 clearly illustrates that a **large** portion (as opposed to **no** portion as recited in claim 18), and arguably the **entire** portion, of the "ground pattern" 7 is located on a portion of the second side of resin layer 17 opposite a portion of the first side of resin layer 17 which faces the "patterned inductor" (circuit pattern 12). Thus, it is clear that the Yamada reference does not disclose or even suggest the structural relationship between the ground pattern and the patterned inductor as recited in independent claim 32. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Yamada reference does not anticipate or even suggest the invention recited in claim 32. Moreover, because the Takaya reference also does not disclose or suggest the structural relationship between the ground pattern and the patterned inductor as recited in independent claim 32, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 32 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Junichi KIMURA

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 9, 2005